



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/531,076	03/18/2000	Geoffrey B. Rhoads	098888-1502	5497
99103	7590	10/20/2011	EXAMINER	
Foley & Lardner LLP			ZIA, SYED	
150 EAST GILMAN STREET				
P.O. BOX 1497			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MADISON, WI 53701-1497			2431	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/20/2011	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/531,076	RHOADS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	SYED ZIA	2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 5) Claim(s) 3-5, 17, 19-24 and 26-52 is/are pending in the application.
  - 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-5, 17, 19-24 and 26-52 is/are rejected.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 10) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                         |                                                                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|                                                                                                                         | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to remarks, and amendments filed July 12, 2011. The amendments filed on July 12, 2011 have been entered and made of record. Claims 3-5, 17, 19-24 and 26-52 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

1. Previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn.

### ***Specification***

1. The specification is objected for a lack of antecedent basis of the claimed terminology "non-transitory computer readable medium". The examiner suggests that the specification be amended to include the term "non-transitory computer readable medium" to avoid the objection to the specification for a lack of antecedent basis of the claimed terminology. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-5, 17, 19-24 and 26-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 3-5, 17, 19-24 and 26-52 of instant application 09/531,076 (hereafter '076) are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claim1-8 of U. S. Patent 7,206,820 (hereafter '820).

Claims 3-5, 17, 19-24 and 26-52 of instant application 09/531,076 (hereafter '076) are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-8 of U. S. Patent 7,206,820 (hereafter '820) since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Claims 3-5, 17, 19-24 and 26-52 of instant application '076 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-

8 of ‘820. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because in view of the obviousness type double patenting rationale enunciated in **Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. United States Gypsum Co., 195 F.3d 1322, 1326, 52 USPQ2d 1590, 1593 (Fed. Cir. 1999)**, because both application claim subject matter that relates to data networking, e.g., systems for directing between objects and associated remote resources. The instant application’s ‘076 above mentioned claims merely claims associating content objects (e.g., audio and video files, etc.) with corresponding information by employing machine readable code (e.g., digital watermark or bar code) conveyed with objects in establishing links to associated electronic resources, such as web pages, where the object can be physical (e.g., a magazine page) or electronic (e.g., music data) where the associated electronic resources can be web sites,

which is an obvious variation of detecting associating and directing, steganographically encoded plural-bit data in a packet (i.e. object) and when that object is presented to an remote system is directed to a handler depending upon the content of packet (i.e. object), the plural-bit data is decoded and used to establish a directing (i.e. establishing a link) to an (internet address corresponding to that object apparatus, as claimed in patent ‘820.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SYED ZIA whose telephone number is (571)272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sz  
October 07, 2011  
/Syed Zia/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431